AD-A031 186

ARMY AVIATION TEST BOARD FORT RUCKER ALA F/G 21/5 PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT TEST OF THE FOREIGN OBJECT SCREEN FOR PARTI--ETC(U) JUN 69 J C KEY

UNCLASSIFIED

NL

OF | AD31186













END
DATE FILMED

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY UNITED STATES ARMY AVIATION TEST BOARD FORT RUCKER, ALABAMA 36360



STEBG-TD

JUN 2 5 1969

SUBJECT: / Final Report of Product Improvement Test of the Foreign Object Screen for Particle Separators on UH-1() and AH-1G Helicopters, USATECOM Project No. 4-6-0105-02

SEE DISTRIBUTION

James C

1. REFERENCES

9) Final rept. Jun 68- Jun 69

5 Jun 69

a. Letter, AMSAV-EOT, Headquarters, US Army Aviation Materiel Command, 20 May 1968, subject: "Request for Test," with 1st Indorsement, AMSTE-BG, Headquarters, US Army Test and Evaluation Command, 18 June 1968.

b. Interim Report of Product-Improvement Test of Inlet Screen for UH-1() and AH-1G Particle Separator, US Army Aviation Test Board. 27 November 1968. USATECOM-4-6- 9145-42

BACKGROUND

UH-1() and AH-1G Helicopters have a particle separator installed that is designed to remove small particles from the engine inlet air. It does not remove, or protect against foreign object damage (FOD) caused by, larger objects such as nuts, bolts, Dzus fasteners, lockwire, etc. Because of the high rate of FOD to engines, the engine manufacturer developed an inlet screen for the separator. At the request of the US Army Aviation Systems Command (USAAVSCOM), the US Army Test and Evaluation Command, on 18 June 1968, directed the US Army Aviation Test Board (USAAVNTBD) to conduct a product-improvement test of the inlet screen (ref la). On 27 November 1968, an interim report was submitted to USAAVSCOM (ref 1b).

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited

Incl 44

036 500

STEBG-TD

SUBJECT: Final Report of Product Improvement Test of the Foreign Object Screen for Particle Separators on UH-1() and AH-1G Helicopters, USATECOM Project No. 4-6-0105-02

3. OBJECTIVE

To determine suitability of the test inlet screen to prevent foreign objects from being ingested by T53 engines installed on UH-1()/AH-1G Helicopters.

4. SCOPE AND METHOD

The USAAVNTBD conducted this product-improvement test at Fort Rucker, Alabama, and vicinity during the period June 1968 to June 1969. Both prototype and production (FSN 1560-167-8113) Foreign Object Screens were provided by USAAVSCOM and installed on UH-1B, UH-1H, UH-1M, and AH-1G Helicopters. These aircraft were flown on profiles established for the T53-L-13 product-improvement test (USATECOM Project No. 4-6-0150-05). Adequacy of the installation procedures was determined and man-hour requirements were recorded. The screens were inspected daily for damage. The engine compressors were visually inspected, as required by the other test.

5. SUMMARY OF RESULTS

a. Test hours accomplished on the inlet screens were:

Helicopter	Serial No.	Hours	Reason for Removal
UH-1B1	63-8659	346.5	Still in service.
UH-1H ²	66-1093	1,458.5	Still in service.
UH-1H ¹	66-1094	556.4	Bottom right-hand forward corner of screen was torn. Equipment Performance Report KF-1 was submitted.
UH-1H ²	66-1094	995.5	Still in service.

Prototype model inlet screens.

²Production model inlet screens.

STEBG-TD

SUBJECT: Final Report of Product Improvement Test of the Foreign Object Screen for Particle Separators on UH-1() and AH-1G Helicopters, USATECOM Project No. 4-6-0105-02

Helicopter	Serial No.	Hours	Reason for Removal
UH-IM ¹	65-9445	1,175.4	Still in service.
AH-1G ¹	66-15355	982.3	The metal frame on which the trunk latch was mounted had bent, resulting in the trunktype fasteners' not securing the screen tightly together. Equipment Performance Report KF-2 was submitted.
AH-1G ¹	66-15355	164.3	Still in service.

- b. The production model screens operated a total of 2,454.0 hours without any damage. The prototype model screens operated a total of 3,184.6 hours with two problems as indicated in paragraph 5a.
- c. Installation procedures furnished with each screen kit were adequate. However, instructions should denote that special care must be taken to assure that the screen is properly secured around the particle separator before closing the trunk type fasteners. Screens required an average of 30 man-minutes for installation. No special tools were required for installation and the time and effort required for installation did not vary between helicopter types.

6. DISCUSSION

The most significant result of this test is that there was no evidence of major FOD to any engine with the inlet screen installed during the entire 5,638.6 flying hours. Prior to utilization of the test screens, FOD had been a major problem on test engines at USAAVNTBD despite a concentrated FOD prevention program.

Prototype model inlet screens.

STEBG-TD

SUBJECT: Final Report of Product Improvement Test of the Foreign Object Screen for Particle Separators on UH-1() and AH-1G Helicopters, USATECOM Project No. 4-6-0105-02

7. CONCLUSION

The test inlet screen is suitable and desirable for installation on UH-1()/AH-1G Helicopters to prevent foreign objects from being ingested by T53 engines.

8. RECOMMENDATIONS

- a. All UH-1()/AH-1G Helicopters be retrofitted with the production model Foreign Object Screen, Federal Stock Number 1560-167-8113.
- b. Service use of production model screens be monitored to determine whether the frame bending problem reported in paragraph 5a recurs to the extent that product improvement is required.

FOR THE PRESIDENT:

l Incl DD 1473 P. V. SCHUMAN Captain, AGC Adjutant

DISTRIBUTION:

Commanding General
US Army Aviation Systems Command
ATTN: AMSAV-EOT
P. O. Box 209, Main Office
St Louis, Missouri 63166

10 copies

Commanding General

US Army Test and Evaluation Command

ATTN: AMSTE-BG

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland 21005

2 copies

Security Classification

DOCUMENT (Security classification of title, body of ebstract and in	CONTROL DATA - R&D	d when the overall report is classified)		
1. ORIGINATING ACTIVITY (Corporate author)				
		Unclassified	classified	
US Army Aviation Test Board	2 b GROUP			
Fort Rucker, Alabama 36360			- 20 7	
3. REPORT TITLE				
PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT TEST OF THE FOREIGN	OBJECT SCREEN FOR PARTI	ICLE SEPARATORS ON UH-1()		
AND AH-1G HELICOPTERS				
4. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES (Type of report and inclusive dates)			
Final Report, June 1968 - June 1969				
5. AUTHOR(S) (Last name, first name, initial)				
			4	
KEY, JAMES C., DAC		•		
6. REPORT DATE	78. TOTAL NO. OF PAGE	5 7b. NO. OF REFS		
June 1969	4	2		
Sa. CONTRACT OR GRANT NO.	98. ORIGINATOR'S REPOR	RT NUMBER(S)		
b. PROJECT NO.				
USATECOM Project No. 4-6-0105-02	96. OTHER REPORT NO(S	(Any other numbers that may be assigned	ed	
	9b. OTHER REPORT NO(S) (Any other numbers that may be assigned this report)			
d.	Firing Code: 0			
10. A VAIL ABILITY/LIMITATION NOTICES				
Fach transmittal of this document outside the Base	turnet of Defence must be a			
		prior approvar of oo man, toronto	1	
Systems Commend			-	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES	12. SPONSORING MILITAR	YACTIVITY		
	US Army Aviation Sys	tems Command		
	St. Louis, Missouri 63	3166		
13 ABSTRACT				

The US Army Aviation Test Board tested the Foreign Object Screen for Particle Separators to determine its suitability to prevent foreign objects from being ingested by T53 engines installed on UH-1()/AH-1C Helicopters. From June 1968 to June 1969 at Fort Rucker, Alabama, five prototype and two production model screens were tested for totals of 3,184 and 2,454 hours, respectively. Two problems -- a torn screen and a bent frame -- were experienced on the prototype screens; no problems occurred with the production screens. There was no evidence of major foreign object damage to any engine with the inlet screen installed during the entire 5,638 test hours. It was concluded that the test inlet screen is suitable and desirable for installation on UH-1()/AH-1G Helicopters to prevent foreign objects from being ingested by T53 engines. It was recommended that T53 engines installed on all UH-1()/AH-1G Helicopters be retrofitted with the production model Foreign Object Screen (FSN 1560-167-8113) and that service use of production model screens be monitored to determine whether the frame bending problem recurs to the extent that product improvement is required.

DD . FORM. 1473

Unclassified

Security Classification

KEA MOBDS	רוח	KY	רוחו	8 ×	רוא	IK C
	HOFE	TW	BOLE	TW	BOLE	TW
ign Object Screen						
engines					100	
1()/AH-1G Helicopters						
icle Separators						
ign object damage						
	-					
					-76	
	all the first		J. 1687			
	100		1000		1	
			100 A			
NO MOST ELECTRICATE STATE OF THE STATE OF TH			T			
INSTRUCTION						
SIGINATING ACTIVITY: Enter the name and address 10, AVA	TIJIBAJI					

imposed by security classification, using standard statements tiations on twiner dissemination of the report, other th

- "'Qualified requesters may obtain copies of this report from DDC."
- "Foreign announcement and dissemination of this report by DDC is not authorized." (7)
- users shall request through "U. S. Government agencies may obtain copies of this report directly from DDC. Other qualified DDC
- shall request through "U. S. military agencies may obtain copies of this report directly from DDC. Other qualified users (4)

ified DDC users shall request through

Services, Department of Commerce, for sale to the public, indi-If the report has been furnished to the Office of Technical

"All distribution of this report is controlled. Qual-

II. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES: Use for additional explana-

cate this fact and enter the price, if known,

(5)

the departmental project office or laboratory sponsoring (paying (or) the research and development. Include address. 13, SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY: Enter the name of

shall be attached. If additional space is required, a continuation sheet it may also appear elsewhere in the body of the technical resummary of the document indicative of the report, even though 13. ABSTRACT: Enter an abstract giving a brief and factual

ports be unclassified. Each paragraph of the abstract shall end with an indication of the military security classification of the information in the paragraph, represented as (TS), (S), (f) It is highly desirable that the abstract of classified re-

There is no limitation on the length of the abstract. However, the suggested length is from 150 to 225 words.

The assignment of links, rules, and weights is context. tary project code name, geographic location, may be used as key words but will be followed by an indication of technical or short phreses that characterize a report and may be used as index entries for cataloging the report. Key words must be selected so that no security classification is required. Identies a such as equipment model designation, itsede name, willisers project code mane, exceptions, may be used as 14. KEY WORDS: Key words are technically meaningful terms

tense activity or other organization (corporate author) issuing

ance with appropriate security regulations. all security classification of the report. Indicate whether "Restricted Data" is included. Marking is to be in accord-24. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION: Enter the over-

the group number. Also, when applicable, show that optional markings have been used for Group 3 and Group 4 as authorrective 5200. 10 and Armed Forces Industrial Manual. Enter 2b. GROUP: Automatic downgrading is specified in DoD Di-

immediately following the title. tion, show title classification in all capitals in parenthesis capital letters. Titles in all cases should be unclassified. If a meaningful title cannot be selected without classifica-3. REPORT TITLE: Enter the complete report title in all

report, e.g., interim, progress, summary, annual, or final. Give the inclusive dates when a specific reporting period is 4. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES: If appropriate, enter the type of

the principal author is an absolute minimum requirement. or in the report. Enter last name, first name, middle initial. If military, show rank and branch of service. The name of 5. AUTHOR(S): Enter the name(s) of author(s) as shown on

on the report, use date of publication. 6. REPORT DATE: Enter the date of the report as day, month, year, or month, year. If more than one date appears

number of pages containing information. should follow normal pagination procedures, i.e., enter the 7s. TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGES: The total page count

references cited in the report. 19. NUMBER OF REFERENCES: Enter the total number of

the report was written the applicable number of the contract or grant under which 88. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER: If appropriate, enter

subproject number, system numbers, task number, etc. military department identification, such as project number, 8p' 8c' & 8d. PROJECT NUMBER: Enter the appropriate

be unique to this report. and controlled by the originating activity. This number must cial report number by which the document will be identified 98. ORICINATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S): Enter the offi-

assigned any other report numbers (either by the originator or by the sponsor), also enter this number(s), 99. OTHER REPORT NUMBER(S): If the report has been